

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/485,245	03/27/2000	ALISON HOPKINS	28911/36128	1697
75	590 10/21/2003		EXAM	INER
MARSHALL O'TOOLE GERSTEIN			WILDER, CYNTHIA B	
MURRAY & BORUN 6300 SEARS TOWER			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
233 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE			1637	
CHICAGO, IL 60606-6402			DATE MAILED: 10/21/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/485,245	HOPKINS, ALISON				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Cynthia B. Wilder, Ph.D.	1637				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespond nce address				
THE REPLY FILED 07 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avifinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a n places the application in				
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The 	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP				
fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Official timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amouthe shortened statutory period for reply on the cellater than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or				
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) Methey raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without canceli NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed amendment				
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because:		dered but does NOT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected:						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. \square The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	roved by the Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)					
10.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>						

Continuation of 10. Other: The newly submitted claims 7-10 drawn to a method, rather than a composition as previously examined, would require further search and consideration to determine patentability because the scope of the invention has now changed..

GARY BENZION, PM.D

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600